

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO. FILING DATE FIRST NAMED INVENTOR ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. CONFIRMATION NO. 12/21/2001 10/023,736 500.34763CX4 4547 Hironari Masui 24956 09/28/2006 **EXAMINER** MATTINGLY, STANGER, MALUR & BRUNDIDGE, P.C. NGUYEN, STEVEN H D 1800 DIAGONAL ROAD ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER **SUITE 370** ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314 2616

DATE MAILED: 09/28/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| | | | SF |
|---|--|---|----------|
| | Application No. | Applicant(s) | - |
| Office Action Summary | 10/023,736 | MASUI ET AL. | |
| | Examiner | Art Unit | |
| | Steven HD Nguyen | 2616 | |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication ap Period for Reply | ppears on the cover sheet with | the correspondence address | S |
| A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING [2] - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1. after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statuf Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). | DATE OF THIS COMMUNICAL 136(a). In no event, however, may a reput will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHE, cause the application to become ABAI | ATION. lly be timely filed IS from the mailing date of this commun NDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). | |
| Status | | | |
| 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02. | July 2006. | | |
| 2a) This action is FINAL . 2b) ⊠ Thi | is action is non-final. | | |
| 3) Since this application is in condition for allowed | · | • | its is |
| closed in accordance with the practice under | Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. | 11, 453 O.G. 213. | |
| Disposition of Claims | | | |
| 4) ☐ Claim(s) 18-27 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdray 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 18-27 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or | awn from consideration. | | |
| Application Papers | · | | |
| 9) The specification is objected to by the Examin 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acceptable and applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examin | cepted or b) objected to by e drawing(s) be held in abeyance ction is required if the drawing(s | e. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.1 | ` ' |
| Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 | | | |
| 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority document application from the International Bureat* See the attached detailed Office action for a list | nts have been received. Its have been received in Apportity documents have been received in the contract of t | plication No eceived in this National Stag | e |
| Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) ☐ Interview Sur | mmary (PTO-413) | |
| 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date | Paper No(s)/ | Mail Date ormal Patent Application | |

DETAILED ACTION

Double Patenting

1. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

2. Claims 18-27 provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 18-26 of copending Application No. 10/023737 in view of Chang.

The copending application discloses a system including a base station and terminal exchanging a reservation packet, reply packet and busy tone wherein the busy tone is used to control the transmission of reservation packets in CDMA scheme. However, the copending does not disclose a busy tone is generated based on traffic of the transmission channel. In the same field of endeavor, Chang discloses a busy tone is generated based on traffic of the transmission channel (Page 1322, left col. from "to prevent" to "user buffer"). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to apply a

Application/Control Number: 10/023,736 Page 3

Art Unit: 2616

method and system for generating a busy tone based on the traffic of the transmission channel as disclosed by Chang into the present application. The motivation would have been to prevent data lost.

This is a <u>provisional</u> obviousness-type double patenting rejection.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Steven HD Nguyen whose telephone number is (571) 272-3159. The examiner can normally be reached on 8-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Wellington Chin can be reached on (571) 272-3134. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

STEVEN NGUYEN PRIMARY EXAMINER A.U 8616